

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

DORETHA GRAY, a/k/a CHRISTA JAYCOX,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

July 27, 2001

No. 225974

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 99-006827

Before: Wilder, P.J., and Hood and Griffin, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right her bench trial convictions for carjacking, MCL 750.529A, armed robbery, MCL 750.529, and possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony, MCL 750.227b. We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Complainant testified she had just purchased cigarettes at a service station when defendant approached her and demanded her keys. Defendant pointed a gun at complainant, she gave defendant the keys, and defendant drove complainant's car away. Defendant was apprehended several days later after she ran a stop sign while driving the stolen car.

On appeal, defendant argues the trial court erred in relying on an in-court identification that was based on suggestive pretrial procedures. However, defendant failed to challenge the in-court identification at trial. Absent manifest injustice, a claim of an unduly suggestive pretrial identification procedure will not be reviewed on appeal unless the defendant objected or moved the trial court to suppress the identification. *People v Mischley*, 164 Mich App 478, 481-482; 417 NW2d 537 (1987). Similarly, issues regarding the propriety of an in-court identification are waived absent objection. *People v Whitfield*, 214 Mich App 348, 351; 543 NW2d 347 (1995).

Defendant waived review of the in-court identification. Complainant did not hesitate in identifying defendant. Defendant admitted being at the scene of the crime. There is no evidence that the identification was tainted by improper procedures.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin